United Nations ECE/CES/2018/14/Add.12

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
15 May 2018

English only

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians
Sixty-sixth plenary session
Geneva, 18-20 June 2018
Item 11 (a) of the provisional agenda
Programme of work of the Statistics subprogramme of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
Reports on the work of the Conference of European Statisticians, its Bureau and Teams of Specialists

Implementation of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Statistical Programme 2017

Note by the secretariat

Addendum

Report of the meeting of the Group of Experts on Measuring Quality of Employment

Summary

The document presents the key outcomes of the meeting of the Group of Experts on Measuring Quality of Employment which took place from 4-6 October 2017. It was organized following a decision of the Conference of European Statisticians and the recommendation of the UNECE Steering Group on measuring quality of employment.

The report is submitted to the Conference of European Statisticians for information.

GE.18-07751(E)

1807751

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. The Group of Experts on Measuring Quality of Employment (MQE) meeting was held in Geneva on 4–6 October 2017. The meeting was organized by the UNECE Steering Group on Measuring Quality of Employment.

2. The meeting was attended by representatives of Australia, Austria, Canada, Chile, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Poland, Russian Federation and Switzerland. The meeting was also attended by representatives of the following specialized agencies and international organizations: Eurostat, the International Labour Organisation (ILO), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing (WIEGO).

3. The meeting was chaired by Silvia Perrenoud of the Swiss Federal Statistical Office. Jason Gilmore, Statistics Canada; Hanna Sutela, Statistics Finland; Federica Pintaldi, the National Institute for Statistics of Italy (Istat); Monica Castillo, ILO; Françoise Carré and Joann Vanek, WIEGO, acted as session chairs.

4. All background documents and presentations of the meeting are available at http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=43848.

II. Organization of the meeting

3. The following topics were discussed at the meeting on the basis of the provided papers and presentations:

(a) Progress of the Steering Group on Measuring Quality of Employment;

(b) Impact of the 19th ICLS resolution;

(c) Experiences with quality of employment indicators;

(d) New forms of work and their measurement;

(e) Future work agenda topics;

(f) Experiences from countries

(g) Challenges in measuring quality of employment;

(h) Frameworks related to quality of employment;

(i) Qualifications and skills.

III. Summary of discussions and main conclusions reached at the meeting

A. Session 1: Progress of the Steering Group on Measuring Quality of Employment

5. The session was dedicated to a presentation of the work of the Steering Group on Measuring Quality of Employment and a presentation of the outcome of an online survey on the use of the *Handbook on Measuring Quality of Employment, A Statistical Framework* (UNECE 2015).

6. The Chair of the Steering Group on Measuring Quality of Employment, Silvia Perrenoud, presented the main outputs of the Steering Group work between 2016 and 2018. The Steering Group has focused on the implementation of the recommendations of the Handbook, on the identification of priority issues of the research agenda where more work is required and on the organisation of this expert group meeting. The Chair highlighted the planned next steps and encouraged participants to share their ideas and suggestions.

7. One of the objectives of the Steering Group is to follow up on the implementation of the recommendations of the Handbook. To this end an online survey on the implementation and usefulness of the Handbook was carried out in 2017. UNECE presented the results of the survey. While there were only few answers from countries, the survey provided useful information about the use of the Handbook, the relevance of the indicators and the availability of data sources in different countries, and areas where the Handbook could be improved. The Steering Group will continue collecting feedback from countries on the implementation and usefulness of the Handbook.

B. Session 2: Impact of the 19th ICLS resolution

Session chair: Françoise Carré, WIEGO network

8. David Hunter, ILO, provided an overview of the main issues raised during deliberations on the revision of the International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE-03). The ILO Expert Group is reviewing the classification to develop two hierarchies for classification: one based on autonomy (dependent vs. independent work) and the other based on economic risk (work for pay or for profit) to be complemented by a list of essential as well as required and recommended cross-cutting variables. Furthermore, an additional high level category of Dependent Contractors is being proposed at the same level as Employee and Self-employed. Also sub-categories of Employees are being designed.

9. Monica Castillo, ILO, reviewed the main outlines of the 19th ICLS resolution on work activities and employment. She highlighted the definition of "work activities" and the boundaries of employment within it and their relationship to the SNA boundary. The definition of work activities covers volunteer and other non-remunerated work activities and may have repercussions for some of the indicators within the Quality of Employment framework. Some quality of employment indicators may be reported for all work activities, beyond employment, while others are not relevant, for example those on work-life balance based on characteristics of the main paid job. Also, the new definition of work and employment creates difficulty for implementation of the existing indicator for Child Labor (sub dimension 1 B) because it defines employment only for those over age 15. Also, because the new definition of employment excludes own-use production of goods from employment, a difficulty arises with the indicator on Informal Employment, which is based on the 17th ICLS definition of employment.

10. Monica Castillo presented the ILO Steering Group recommendation to maintain both sub dimension 1B and continue to base the Informal Employment indicator on the 17th ICLS Resolution on employment in order to continue to be relevant across developed and developing economies. The Steering Group also proposed to issue a guidance document to complement the existing Handbook and provide information on potential impacts of the 19th ICLS definition, review which indicators may apply to work activities and provide limited guidance on selected indicators, and give detailed attention to the two indicators listed above.

11. Monica Castillo reported on pilot tests underway in 10 countries to measure the difference between paid and non-remunerated work. She also identified a resource, the ILO manual on non-remunerated work. Non-remunerated work needs to be reported in a

continuous manner only in countries where it is common. In other countries, modules may be sufficient.

12. It was noted that measuring unpaid work may be difficult. Using of alternative sources, e.g. national Time Use Surveys, can provide useful information.

13. There was general agreement on the proposal to keep the Handbook as it is and to complement it with a separate guidance on how to adapt to the definitions of the 19th ICLS resolution.

C. Session 3: Experiences with quality of employment indicators

Session chair: Hanna Sutela, Statistics Finland

14. There were three presentations in session 3, which demonstrated different practical implementations of quality of employment indicators: in Israel some indicators were included as a part of Well-being indicators published by the Statistical Bureau; Austria had tested the feasibility and relevance of selected quality of employment indicators on the basis of their LFS data; and members of the Steering Group had compiled a joint article comparing quality of employment by selected indicators in five different countries.

15. The following points emerged from the discussion:

- Mark Feldeman from the Central Bureau of Statistics presented the Israeli example of involving academics, policy makers and the public in defining the need and form of building a set of quality of well-being/employment indicators was a welcomed approach; so was the principle of collecting statistical information on these topics to support better policy making;
- The Austrian endeavor showed that the selected indicators were comprehensible as defined in the Handbook. Judith Foster (Statistics Austria) explained how the indicators were technically feasible and could with few exceptions, be built on the basis of the LFS. Almost all indicators turned out to be relevant in the Austrian context;
- Silvia Perrenoud, the Swiss Federal Statistical Office, presented the joint article comparing selected indicators of quality of employment among five countries, Finland, Germany, Israel, Italy and Switzerland. The analysis proved the general feasibility of indicators for international comparison - despite the fact that some of the indicators could be considered as more comparable than the others;
- Quality of employment is a multidimensional phenomenon, and the selection of indicators for analysis may play a significant role in describing the state of play of quality of employment in a given country;
- There is a great interest of different stakeholders and users towards country rankings. However, depending on the selection of indicators, the relative ranking of the countries may vary. Overall, caution is needed when making country comparisons. Sufficient contextual information and additional explanation for the correct interpretation and use of the statistics should be made available to users;
- The examples presented in the session were found encouraging and there was a wish that more countries would start to compile and publish information on quality of employment using the Handbook and drawing on the support of the Steering Group.

D. Session 4: New forms of work and their measurement

Session Chair: Joann Vanek, WIEGO network

16. The session was based on the following presentations:

- Michael Horrigan (BLS, USA) described the new Contingent Work Survey, which is being undertaken in 2017. The survey builds on the 2005 Contingent Work and Alternative Work Arrangements Survey and the 2016 research of Katz and Kruger which showed significant increases in alternative work arrangements, independent contractors, on call, temporary agency work and workers provided by contract companies from 2005 to 2015. This 2017 survey includes few new questions focused on whether workers have accessed employment through an internet platform. Work provided by contract refers to longer-term relations with a company they are working with and accounts for the largest increase over the period;

- Hanna Sutela, Statistics Finland, presented the challenges of measuring the digitalized work life in surveys. Digitalization refers to how a device may be affecting one's private life rather than simply to the use of a device. It is a complex process. It affects different stages in the work process so it is not clear where to focus questions. As digital systems are operated from remote locations, the measurement of the effects of digitalization is difficult. The effects of digitalization include a blurring of the boundaries between work and leisure, tighter control on work performance, and changes in social relations (in work communities, at home and in the use of time). These changes lead to greater stress for workers and have consequences for quality of employment. It was noted that it is difficult to operationalize all dimensions of digital work in a survey questionnaire.

E. Session 5: Future work agenda topics

Session Chair: Monica Castillo, ILO

17. Fabrice Murtin, OECD, discussed challenges in measuring discrimination at work, based on the 2017 OECD Guidelines on Measuring Quality of the Working Environment. The measurement of specific aspects of the topic such as type, cause, perpetrator, consequences and degrees of discrimination at work was highlighted. He suggested that guidelines may be needed to support wording of questions and noted that subjective questions seem to perform well in surveys. Regarding the intensity of discrimination at work, a detailed scale set of response categories works best as opposed to a simple yes/no question. He presented information on a comparative review of various surveys on discrimination at work, including the European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS), the EU Labour Force Survey (LFS) ad hoc modules, Eurobarometer Flash Module 398, and national surveys. Based on the review, he suggested that the consequences in terms of negative effects of discrimination at work are best measured with a scale set of responses; around 10 questions are needed in the questionnaire to support identification of the types of discrimination, causes, and consequences. It is recommended to seek information about the age, sex and ethnicity of the respondents reporting discrimination at work.

18. Hanna Sutela, Statistics Finland, presented research regarding measuring discrimination at work in Finland. A key challenge in measuring discrimination at work relates to the subjectivity of questions and how these are interpreted across countries. In some countries, the threshold for reporting may be higher when discrimination at work is more prevalent. The issue of the difficulty of obtaining information on discrimination in the

recruitment process was mentioned. Moreover, the issue of underrepresentation of certain groups in the survey sample who may be prone to discrimination at work is a concern. The results of the Finnish Quality of Work Life Survey (FQWLS) in 2013 were presented, specifically as regards measurement of discrimination at work, and lessons learnt. In Finland, favouritism was reported quite high as a cause of workplace discrimination, and young women reported discrimination more often than other groups. A web survey has recently been conducted to follow up on qualitative interviews of persons identified as having experienced discrimination at work in the FQWLS. The need to measure coping mechanisms for victims of discrimination at work was discussed.

19. Italian experiences in measurement of job satisfaction were given by Federica Pintaldi, Istat. The presentation focussed on new questions in the Italian LFS to better understand the link between quality of employment and job satisfaction. The Quality of Employment and Well-being framework in Italy has 12 dimensions, including dimension 5 on work and life balance. The framework includes 14 selected decent work and quality of employment indicators. The LFS added nine new questions on job satisfaction and job insecurity, which was previously omitted. A key aim was to define and measure the target variables related to job satisfaction. Career advancement, earnings and Job insecurity were key variables to measure job satisfaction. Involuntary part-time workers experienced lower levels of job satisfaction than other groups. Information on job satisfaction can be collected by a (larger) set of questions in an LFS ad hoc module, or by including (fewer) questions in a core LFS questionnaire. An analysis of which indicator to use as a better measure of job satisfaction, either a mean of the estimates of several variables or a single question on job satisfaction, gave comparable results. The issues of measuring job satisfaction among self-employed workers versus paid employees and job satisfaction by job tenure were discussed. It was noted that there is often a honeymoon phase in the early period of a job.

20. Christian Wingerter (Eurostat) presented the review of the indicators on work-life-balance. The current indicators in the framework includes employment rate of mothers and fathers, possibility to work at home, commuting time, care leave entitlement, parental leave and child care use (experimental). Other indicators that have relevance include long working hours, night work, evening work, weekend work and flexible work schedule. The indicator on child care facilities is now dropped, while four others need work, including care for incapacitated relatives, effect of parenthood on the employment rate, work intrusion into leisure time, and self-perceived work-life balance. Labour force participation rates are almost three percentage points higher among women with no regular care responsibilities versus those caring for incapacitated adults. The inclusion of a variable on the effects of older care on current employment and types of effects has not been decided yet. The issue of whether to use the employment rate or the at-work rate for the indicator on employment of mothers and fathers was discussed. An example of female employment rates and work attendance rates in Finland and Sweden (woman aged 15 to 64 years) was discussed. In Finland, parental leave is not counted as employment. In countries that have very long periods of parental leave, the employment rate may give a distorted picture.

21. The Swiss approach to present the indicators was presented by Silvia Perrenoud, the Swiss Federal Statistical Office. The presentation showed how indicators from the Handbook have been disseminated, including the publication of a booklet in 2011, which was updated in 2015. In the print version, there is a short text covering the last 10 years and a graph for each indicator, using different colours for visualization of different dimensions. In the online summary table of indicators, there are additional breakdowns, metadata and regular updates. Further examples of topic areas that are presented include migration, education, city statistics, sustainable development, and GDP and beyond. The MONET initiative seeks to monitor the sustainable development goal indicators in Switzerland. MONET covers 12 topics, including 73 indicators, each presented with a pictogram. In the Swiss experience in measuring quality of employment, the main effort

comes in the run up to the launch of the first publication of the sets of indicators, but once launched, the updates become easier.

22. Carsten Boldsen, UNECE, informed about the work of the UNECE Task Force on leading composite and sentiment (LCS) indicators established to develop recommendations of good practices for NSOs to produce LCS indicators. Weighting of individual series into a composite indicator is a main challenge, and the selection of indicators, dimensions and weights may be questioned and raise political dispute. Nonetheless, such indicators give NSOs visibility. The issue of the complex task of the NSO communicating LCS indicators was also emphasized. In the Framework of MQE, the question was raised about how we could make a choice of a common set of indicators for all countries when it was supposed to be a toolbox for countries to select from. Conclusions from the discussion suggested that perhaps this is not the most urgent topic but that it can be kept on the list of possible future work of the steering group.

F. Session 6: Experiences from countries

Session chair: Federica Pintaldi, ISTAT

23. The session was based on presentations by the Bureau of Labour Statistics (BLS), the United States of America and Statistics Canada. The first presentation, "Declining labour force participation rates in the U.S." by Michael W. Horrigan BLS, concerned changing labour market participation linked to demographic trends and cultural changes, in particular, young people's longer involvement in education attainment. These cohorts are interviewed every year or every two years and a complete event history of their labour force participation (employed, unemployed, out of the labour force) is recorded for every week of their lives. The NLSY79 cohort included ages 25-30 between 1983 and 1996, the NLSY97 cohort included ages 25-30 between 2006 and 2016.

24. The second presentation, "Long car commutes" by Jason Gilmore, Statistics Canada, concerned quality of employment variable 3C3 "Commuting Time" within Dimension 3 Working Time and Work-Life Balance. This presentation was based on 2011 data of Census/National Household Survey. The focus of the presentation was long car commutes, defined as people who use at least one hour getting to work in a car each day. The indicator 3C3 has a large impact on measuring work life balance and health. Furthermore, commuting time between work and home can also be stressful, tiring and expensive, according to research.

G. Group work: Challenges in measuring quality of employment

25. The session was based on group discussions about the following issues:

(a) Issues for future work and research:

- Selection of most important issues for future work and research from the Handbook on Measuring Quality of Employment;
- More research in teleworking and precarious employment;
- Further development of indicators regarding prospects for promotion, including the use of longitudinal indicators of mobility within and across employers.

(b) New topics for the research agenda:

- Suggestion to consider new indicators, e.g.: time not at work; hours at work paid/unpaid; hours of sleep; hours of commuting;

- Further research on the topic of the intrusion of work into the private life, digital employment, care for elderly persons or commuting in the case when persons move for employment.

(c) Experimental indicators:

- There is a need to collect more practical experience on the usefulness of the experimental indicators before making decisions on whether they should be included in the framework.

(d) Ongoing issues of future work:

- There is a need to promote the Handbook and collect more feedback on its usefulness from countries.

(e) International organizations:

- International organizations should continue supporting countries in developing and compiling indicators on quality of employment through e.g. facilitating exchange of experiences and good practices and promotion of the Handbook;
- The possibility to create an international database with quality of employment indicators should be considered. A designated website for exchange of research work and good practices in measuring quality of employment could also be established. It was noted that resources for the establishment and maintenance of a database or a website for research material would need to be provided.

H. Session 7: Frameworks related to quality of employment

Session chair: Jason Gilmore, Statistics Canada

26. There were three presentations by the international organizations in session 7, which described different frameworks related to the quality of employment.

27. First presentation given by Chrisitian Wingerter, Eurostat, talked about Eurobase indicators on quality of employment. Eurostat is offering a public web page to promote the availability of indicators on quality of employment and of the Statistical Framework on Quality of Employment. This page has both data and background information about the framework. All countries are encouraged to use this resource, and to promote its availability to all interested users. Countries are invited to provide feedback and suggestions on its user friendliness, and to provide any data that can fill the data gaps.

28. Second presentation given by Monica Castillo, ILO, on the Comparison on the DWMF and FMQE. The key takeaway for this presentation is that these two frameworks have some differences as well as similarities (in content, in their history and in use, etc.), and they are both important and valuable for user communities.

29. The presentation by Fabrice Murtin on OECD Job Quality Framework focused on earnings quality, labour market security and quality of the work environment. It is a complementary framework to FMQE. The Job Strain Index (4-question version) has great potential for filling data gaps in the JQF and the FMQE, and it should be considered by the FMQE Expert Group.

30. It was concluded that different frameworks that touch on quality of employment should be considered for their complementary aspects and not as duplication. Audiences and users can have different needs, but for all cases of different quality frameworks, it is

important to collaborate and be informed of their content and uses so that all these frameworks can develop and improve.

I. Session 8: Qualifications and skills

31. ILO has been asked to develop a framework for measuring qualifications and skills mismatch. Valentina Stoevska, ILO, presented the work with this framework, Qualification and skill mismatch: Concepts and Measurement. It was stressed that the incidence of qualification mismatch is sensitive to the approach used, and all qualification mismatch measures are likely to overestimate the level of mismatch (voluntary or temporarily). The skill mismatch measurement requires additional variables on skill related job characteristics in the labour force survey.

IV. Proposal for future work

32. The meeting participants agreed that:

(a) Work on the following topics should continue to have priority:

- Discrimination at work;
- Job satisfaction;
- Work/life balance;
- Approaches to present the indicators;
- Review of indicators for dimension 4 Security of employment and social protection.

(b) The review of indicators for (in particular) dimension 4 should await the adoption of the revision of the ICSE.

(c) In addition, work on the following areas should be given priority:

- New forms of employment and their measurement, including precarious employment, the digitalized labour market, teleworking, the GIG economy;
- Care for elderly persons;
- Commuting;
- Intrusion of employment into the private life.

(d) Indicators marked as experimental need further development. Work on these indicators should continue in terms of collecting experiences on their compilation and suitability;

(e) It would be useful to collect more feedback and experiences from countries on producing QE indicators according to the statistical framework;

(f) The Steering Group on MQE should follow-up on the research agenda proposed in the Handbook on Measuring Quality of Employment, taking the priorities and suggested topics of the 2017 Expert Group meeting into account. As part of this, the Steering Group should:

- Develop a proposal on how to take the definitions of the 19th ICLS resolution on Work Statistics into account in the statistical framework;
- Discuss the possibilities of establishing an online database with QE indicators as well as a designated webpage for exchange of research and practical experiences in MQE;
- Discuss ways in which to further promote the statistical framework for MQE, including having more indicators published under the headline of QE.

33. Meeting participants suggested that an expert group meeting on MQE be organized to follow-up on the issues and priorities raised at this meeting.

United Nations ECE/CES/2018/14/Add.13

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
15 May 2018

English only

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians
Sixty-sixth plenary session
Geneva, 18-20 June 2018
Item 11 (a) of the provisional agenda
Programme of work of the Statistics subprogramme of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
Reports on the work of the Conference of European Statisticians, its Bureau and Teams of Specialists

Implementation of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Statistical Programme 2017

Note by the secretariat

Addendum

Report of the Workshop on Statistical Data Collection 'Overcoming Challenges through Modernisation'

Summary

The document presents the key outcomes of the Workshop on Statistical Data Collection "Overcoming Challenges through Modernisation" which took place from 10 to 12 October 2017 in Ottawa, Canada. The meeting was organized following a decision of the Conference of European Statisticians in 2017.

The report is submitted to the Conference of European Statisticians for information.

GE.18-07762(E)
1807762

Please recycle

I. Attendance

1. The Workshop on Statistical Data Collection: Overcoming Challenges through Modernisation was held in Ottawa, Canada, from 10-12 October 2017. It was attended by 70 participants (64 representatives and 6 observers). They represented the statistical offices of Australia, Canada, Curaçao, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America as well as the International Labour Organization (ILO), the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations High commissioner for Refugees and World Bank. The Goldsmith College of the University of London, Washington State University, and the NPD Group were also represented

2. The Workshop was hosted by Statistics Canada and was organized under the responsibility of the High-Level Group Modernisation Committee on Statistical Products and Sources. The Organizing Committee consisted of Barteld Braaksma (Statistics Netherlands), Frances Comerford (Central Statistical Office Ireland), Bilal Kurban (Turkish Statistical Institute), Lise Rivais (Statistics Canada), Evelyn Ruppert (Goldsmith College of University of London), Paulo Saraiva dos Santos (Statistics Portugal) and Niki Sylianidou (Eurostat).

II. Organization of the meeting

3 The workshop was chaired by Mrs. Lise Rivais from Statistics Canada. Mr. Stéphane Dufour, Assistant Chief Statistician of Statistics Canada, opened the workshop and welcomed the participants. Mr. Don A. Dillman from Washington State University provided a keynote address.

4. The agenda included the following substantive topics:

(a) Alternative sources and ways of data collection to reduce survey burden;

(b) Modernisation of data collection;

(c) Use of new technologies, skills and mind-set for data collection;

(d) Management of data collection;

(e) Communication with Respondents.

5. In total, two keynote addresses and thirty presentations were given within the five sessions. Each session was concluded with a small group discussions focusing on lessons learned and on activities in data collection to eliminate, reduce, increase and create. The outcomes of the discussions are documented in the annex. A voting round took place to identify the most relevant topics in each of the four action types for future work.

6. All abstracts, papers and presentations from the Workshop on Statistical Data Collection - Workshop are available at the workshops webpages https://statswiki.unece.org/x/cQKoBw.

III. Main conclusions reached at the meeting

7. Key items identified for future work included (by type of action and in order of preference):

A. Eliminate

- Eliminate the use of non-reusable devices;
- Eliminate duplication of efforts by more collaboration;
- Eliminate issues with access to alternative data by removing legal and other barriers;
- Eliminate stove pipe and silo structures and create standardised processes.

B. Reduce

- Reduce the length and complexity of questionnaires without losing information;
- Reduce the time to make a decision and accept better the risks of innovation such as new collection strategies;
- Reduce the use of surveys by using administrative data and other sources;
- Reduce the number of data silos towards a more integrated data collection framework.

C. Increase

- Increase investment in human resources (capacity building) to have the capacity/capability for technological change;
- Increase international cooperation in innovative projects;
- Increase the sharing of code and stimulate open source;
- Increase providing personalized feedback to respondents.

D. Create

- Create modular solutions to reduce the number of surveys;
- Create interactivity and dialogue with the respondents (e.g. 'gamification' of surveys);
- Create dedicated teams to research the use of alternative sources such as big data;
- Create communication based on behavioural and psychological testing;
- Create systems that can deal with multi-mode data collection.

Annex

Summary of discussions on substantive topics

A. Topic (i): Alternative sources and ways of data collection to reduce survey burden

1. This session was organized by Lisa Rivais (Statistics Canada) and Niki Stylianidou (Eurostat). In included the following presentations:

- United States Census Bureau: Evaluating the use of publicly available building permit data to compliment data collection and analysis of construction surveys;
- Istat (Italy): Integration of administrative and survey data to reduce respondent burden: the Italian experience in the field of agriculture statistics;
- World Bank: Surveying informal enterprises: applying stratified adaptive cluster sampling using CAPI with implementation and monitoring tools;
- United States Census Bureau: Reducing survey burden through third-party data sources;
- Statistics Netherlands: Dissolving Questionnaire Borders with Technology;
- Statistics Portugal: Using Administrative Data for Statistical purposes - Statistics Portugal Experience;
- Statistics Netherlands: Centre for Big Data Statistics.

2. The following points were identified by the participants as lessons learned:

- It takes time to process the structured data coming to statistical organization - processing time and challenges should not be underestimated;
- Administrative data can be used to validate statistics but also the reverse;
- Use more administrative data;
- Apps can be useful.

3. The following actions were identified for future work:

(a) Eliminate:

- some of the policy and legal barriers currently in place restrain access to the information;
- rationalize/reduce/eliminate redundancies;
- increase use of partial substitution of admin data rather than full substitution aiming to eventually get full substitution;
- redundancy, especially for business surveys;
- duplication;
- statistics which may be inconsistent, obsolete, in duplication;
- complexity of data requests;
- paper.

(b) Reduce:

- legal requirements in terms of confidentiality of the information;
- consolidating data requests (could also eliminate);

- duplication of collecting the "same" data from multiple sources ... merging surveys together;
- number of surveys;
- dependency on other organizations;
- cost to programmes;
- burden;
- numbers of primary surveys;
- cost;
- respondents burden;
- time to market.

(c) Increase:

- a culture shift is required in terms of how the collected data is to be used, the quality of the information collected and the process to use this data in official statistics;
- the possibility that the current historical series may not be maintained;
- comparability issues and methodological validation required in using new data - robustness and quality of the data;
- the possibility that the concepts may differ with the use of structured big data
- use of admin data;
- self-response that does not require follow up first;
- personalized feedback for data collection;
- administrative comparability between countries: advantage or disadvantage;
- administrative data and meeting new requirements;
- integration of multiple sources into a single statistics;
- access to big data;
- coherence analysis;
- external partnership;
- collaboration, modernisation;
- trust through outreach, communication, education;
- linking of data, increase richness.

(d) Create:

- new system able to process the structured information coming for administrative sources in a timely manner;
- legislation/agreement for supply and use of alternative sources replacing survey data;
- new data by data linkage, maybe easier than big data initiatives;
- specific teams to research alternative sources such as big data;
- Investment in collaboration with other organizations;
- better experience for respondents;
- methodology to relevance of statistics;
- branding of statistics – awareness;
- harmonization (variables, questionnaires);
- added value for respondents;
- Innovation in data analysis, visualization.

B. Topic (ii): Modernisation of data collection

4. This session was organized by Mr. Paulo Saraiva (Statistics Portugal) and Niki Stylianidou (Eurostat). It included the following presentations:

- ONS (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): Transformation of UK Business Data Collection;
- CSO (Ireland): Modernisation of Business Statistics data collection;
- Statistics Netherlands: Phoenix: Redesign of the data collection process and systems;
- ONS (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): Transforming social survey data collection in the UK – opportunities and challenges;
- Istat (Italy): A standard procedure for the optimization of survey questionnaires design;
- Statistics Denmark: Standardized and modernized data editing in Statistics Denmark;
- International Monetary Fund: Moving to Automated Collection using SDMX.

5. The following actions were identified for future work:

(a) Eliminate:

- some administrative constraint in the decision making process;
- number of silo;
- redundant system;
- unique definitions for similar concepts;
- legacy system;
- duplication of effort by more collaboration;
- stove pipe silos and create standardise processes;
- fear of using non-traditional modes such as social medias.

(b) Reduce:

- number of teams involve in decision process;
- number of owner of various system;
- the number of silo data to a more integrated framework;
- the number of different questionnaire designs (variation between questionnaires);
- over-editing in questionnaire;
- business contacts by integrating surveys;
- response burden;
- length and complexity of questionnaires without losing information;
- time to make a decision and accept better the risks of innovation such as new collection strategies;
- Reduce traditional collection modes with more non-traditional modes i.e. social medias.

(c) Increase:

- realistic funding assessment;
- the importance of higher organisational goal over survey specific needs;
- complexity of modernisation to higher management;
- resistance to change;
- alignment of the organizational structure to match new systems/processes;
- better and specific documentation for legacy systems. Difficult to transition from old systems to new without understanding what old systems did;
- usage of modular approach;
- sharing code, open source;

- finding new ways to engage respondents for different survey topics and various segments of the population;
- respondent relations in social and business surveys are different - e.g. continuity and trust with business surveys;
- how and when to prefill questionnaires - raw or edited data? Do we need guidelines?
- creation of structure for peer support across different NSI with different capacities;
- digital communication through all stages of processes;
- going beyond conventional cognitive testing with usability testing.

(d) Create:

- new governance to align with new system and process;
- awareness of the complexity of modernisation process;
- a system that can deal with multi-mode collection;
- pre-defined quality standards to prevent over editing;
- better standards for documentation;
- allocation of budget and resources for innovation;
- the culture;
- develop and implement generalized processing: data collection and common approaches and guidelines applicable to all surveys;
- interactivity and dialogue with the respondents i.e. "gamification" of surveys.

C. Topic (iii): Use of new technologies, skills and mind-set for data collection

6. This session was organized by Bilal Kurban (Turkish Statistical Institute) and Barteld Braaksma (Statistics Netherlands). It included the following presentations:

- Estates (Germany): The impact of ongoing technical developments on the entire data production – from concepts, programming to testing and data collection;
- MONSTAT (Montenegro): Agricultural Census in Montenegro – methods of data collection;
- World Bank: Survey Solutions - an integrated system of data collection, survey management and data aggregation;
- Statistics Netherlands: Questionnaire design for smartphones (and tablets) – an on-going journey from mobile unfriendly to mobile friendly to mobile optimization;
- Goldsmiths, University of London: A citizen data app: reflections on a collaborative practice;
- World Bank: Surveying Informal Enterprises: Applying Stratified Adaptive Cluster Sampling using CAPI with Implementation and Monitoring Tools.

7. The following actions were identified for future work:

(a) Eliminate:

- stigmatisation of failure in research;
- overlap between innovation and production;
- working towards a gold standard and accept a workable solution;
- not being stuck in our old ways;
- roadblocks to creative thinking without being too critical;
- long questionnaires which are not suitable for mobile collection.

(b) Reduce:

- time frame for decision making (such as funding) in innovation projects;
- risk aversion;
- single mode surveys;
- costs;
- use of surveys using administrative data or other sources;
- amount of survey data in our statistics - new mix of modes and data sources.

(c) Increase:

- expertise in new technologies;
- international cooperation in innovative projects;
- investment in human resources (capacity building) to have capacity/capability for technological change;
- pace among others partners of the current collection challenges;
- usability to have a better experience for respondent;
- alternative modes to align with respondent requirements;
- communication using multi-mode package to increase response rates. Address differences in communications via apps which calls for person to download which is different from a link from a web platform;
- new method requirement to work with technology constraints;
- new methods for new technologies e.g. design for mobile devices;
- different concepts, definitions, categories of data taking into account the mode e.g. big data;
- convincing subject matter to use new technology to optimize collection.

(d) Create:

- an agile governance in and for innovations;
- structure solely dedicated to transformation;
- modular solutions to reduce numbers of surveys;
- administrative centralized and standardized databases;
- new infrastructure to address new technology;
- profiling functionality in questionnaires;
- apps to measure things that are difficult to measure;
- environment conducive to innovation/experiment;
- community of best practices for modern survey design (mobile /online questionnaire);
- design for Smart Phone should tested;
- new relationship and collaboration with society and individuals;
- redesign focus from survey to mode or interface;
- prepare for susceptibility to risks with different digital technologies such as breakdowns. Prepare communications and backup plan;
- new methods for new technologies.

D. Topic (iv): Management of data collection

8. This session was organized by Paulo Saraiva (Statistics Portugal) and Evelyn Ruppert (Goldsmith, University of London). It included the following presentations:

- Statistics Canada: Active Management Framework to Monitor and Manage Data Collection;

- Statistics Estonia: Modernizing data collection preparation, management, data correction. Integration of data collection infrastructures and technologies to optimize processes and resources;
- Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia: Intersectoral partnership and outsourcing of data collection in the Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia;
- Statistics Canada: Statistics Canada's Experiences to Manage Responsive Collection Design for Household Surveys;
- INEGI (Mexico): Planning the 2020 Census in Mexico: perspective and challenges for data collection;
- Statistics Poland: CORStat as a tool for managing surveys and interviewers.

9. The following actions were identified for future work:

(a) Eliminate:

- Operational constraint with modern tools
- Manual processes
- Monolithical approach.
- Non formal management - be more proactive
- Bad behaviours with different monitoring techniques such as GPS
- Use of non-reusable devices / platforms
- Over collection once target has been met

(b) Reduce:

- Complexity of monitoring tool
- Operational burden by sharing workload (between surveys for example)
- Paper management burden
- Use of incentives (gifts) which are causing some sample groups to be over represented. (i.e. lower incomes over represented).
- Technology barriers by leaving legacy systems
- Technical difficulties; limitations of systems (the ones we put on ourselves).
- Reduce complexity of changing mode during collection
- Reducing the risks on non-bias by introducing efficiencies
- Focus on hard to get respondents unless they are high priority
- Over management and micro management of field force.

(c) Increase:

- Importance of using GIS data
- Field logistics complexity in large scale operation
- Use of integrated case management to transfer/communicate between collection modes
- Use of population registers
- Modularity of case management systems.
- A framework to monitor collection
- Best practices and challenges
- International collaboration in regard to different collection systems, collection management, training, etc.
- Feedback to field interviewers on progress
- Repurposing digital devices with other data collection or school.

(d) Create:

- International cooperation in developing complex systems with similar requirements

- Efficient communication strategy between all partners in NSI
- Tools for efficient resource allocation
- Partnership to share resources (including physical resources)
- Automation of allocation of work
- Machine learning
- Create synergy between data collection of social & business statistics
- Create automatics allocation of work in the field
- Create a more flexible communication system in case management
- Specific data collection coverage target by priority
- Management system on business statistics.

E. Topic (v): Communication with respondents

10. This session was organized by Frances Comerford (CSO, Ireland). It included the following presentations:

- Statistics Denmark: Optimization of data collection from enterprises by use of nudging initiatives;
- Central Statistical Office Poland: Communication with respondents in business surveys conducted by Reporting Portal;
- Statistics Finland: How to motivate and catch hard-to-reach groups in household surveys;
- Statistics Estonia: Activities to reduce response burden: pre-filling of questionnaires, development of questionnaires and electronic data submission environment eSTAT based on feedback from respondents and data processing phase;
- ONS (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): Using Behavioural Science to influence respondents … and ourselves.

11. The following actions were identified for future work:

(a) Eliminate:

- traditional approach
- barriers to communication with respondents by ensuring multiple contact options (i.e. phone, email, etc.)
- complex survey forms
- one dimensional approach of population
- extensive - complicated communication with respondents.

(b) Reduce:

- use of non-monetary incentives
- time lag for collection periods
- unnecessary information (keep it simple) i.e. too much official information that respondents do not read
- simplify communication such as a letter to respondent
- raise good respondent experience
- personal support by providing more interactive digital support.

(c) Increase:

- awareness of collection activities between intercensal period
- user experience interest on the collection portal

- use of behavioural economics
- outreach to schools or difficult to reach respondents
- opportunities for respondent feedback
- self-administrated customer service.
- personalize the collection of data on large enterprises
- knowledge about key contact information
- good respondent experiences.

(d) Create:

- reports to return to respondents with relevant data
- use of social media
- portal for business respondents
- personalized feedback data/products to respondents to incentivize
- more effective respondent communication based on behavioural theory and respondent behaviour
- opportunity to test different ways of communication
- dedicated team for the enterprise surveys
- user experience measures- index
- new non-monetary incentives
- instant and personalized feedback.

F. Lessons learned

12. Across the sessions, the following points were identified as lessons learned:

- It takes time to process the structured data coming to a statistical organization - processing time and challenges should not to be underestimated;
- Administrative data can be used to validate statistics but also the reverse;
- Use more administrative data;
- Apps can be useful;
- Investigate use of and access to Big Data;
- Administrative data can be used to validate statistics, but also the other way around;
- There is a discrepancy between legislation and public perception;
- Parallel development and production is not ideal;
- Adopt one step at a time;
- Systems cannot be fully standardized;
- Feedback to respondents and the measures of results of the benefits of these feedback, is a good way to improve relationships
- Great difference between countries and diversity on how they will achieve the same goals;
- Design for mobile collection first, then move on to design for other devices;
- Question the use of non-monetary incentives.

United Nations ECE/CES/2018/14/Add.14

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
15 May 2018

English only

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians
Sixty-sixth plenary session
Geneva, 18-20 June 2018
Item 11 (a) of the provisional agenda
Programme of work of the Statistics subprogramme of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
Reports on the work of the Conference of European Statisticians, its Bureau and Teams of Specialists

Implementation of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Statistical Programme 2017

Note by the secretariat

Addendum

Report of the Conference of European Statisticians Bureau, 10-11 October 2017

Summary

The present report is submitted in compliance with the Rules Governing the Work of the Conference and its Bureau (ECE/CES/2007/8), adopted by the Conference of European Statisticians at its fifty-third plenary session. Referring to the Rules, the Bureau acts as a steering body of the Conference. The report includes decisions taken by the Bureau at its February 2017 meeting on the work carried out under the auspices of the Conference.

The report is submitted to the Conference of European Statisticians for information.

GE.18-07761(E)
1807761

Please recycle

I Introduction

1. The meeting of the Bureau of the Conference of European Statisticians (CES) was held in Yerevan, Armenia on 10-11 October 2017, hosted by the National Statistical Service of the Republic of Armenia. The following members of the Bureau attended: Ms. M. Bruun (Chair, Finland), Mr. S. Mnatsakanyan (Armenia), Mr. K. Pesendorfer (Austria), Mr. A. Arora (Canada), Mr. M. Kristof (Croatia), Mr. J. Santaella (Mexico) and Mr. J. Pullinger (United Kingdom). The following permanent observers also attended: Mr. V. Sokolin, (CIS-STAT), Ms. M. Kotzeva (Eurostat), Mr. J. R. Rosales (IMF, representing Mr. L. M. Ducharme), Ms. M. Durand (OECD), and Ms. L. Bratanova (UNECE).

2. Ms. T. Luige (UNECE) served as Secretary of the meeting, backed up by Ms. A. Peltola (UNECE). The following staff of the UNECE Statistical Division also attended: Ms. I. Lalor, Mr. S. Vale and Ms. F. Willis-Nunez.

3. UN Statistical Division (UNSD) sent written comments on selected agenda items. The comments were presented to the Bureau and taken into account in the discussion.

II. In-depth reviews of selected statistical areas

A. Emerging issues in statistical communication

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/2 by Ireland

4. The Bureau conducted an in-depth review of emerging issues in statistical communication based on a paper by Ireland with input from Austria, Canada, Finland, Germany, UK and UNECE. Austria and OECD informed the Bureau about the outcomes of the OECD conference "The role of official statistics in an evolving communication society". The Bureau raised the following issues:

(a) There is strong support for considering statistical communication from a strategic viewpoint. The changing environment where official statistics operate pushes to redefine their relevance and role;

(b) Statistical organizations should look at communication strategies in a broader context of risk management and business continuity;

(c) Further work should focus on a common understanding at the strategic level of communication rather than trying to harmonize the actions and tactics;

(d) A broad range of topics could be examined. A strategic approach to communications, issue and crisis management, communication principles, measuring the success and impact of communication are of particular interest;

(e) The necessity to act in real-time environment (e.g., through tweets and social media) poses an additional challenge of how to make the subject matter and communications experts work together and who can be the spokesperson for official statistics;

(f) The work should use available material about communications from outside official statistics;

(g) It will be useful to establish priorities among the list of challenges in statistical communication identified through the review, and focus the work. It is important to share experiences and develop guidance based on good practices. The actions should be

considered in connection with work in other related areas, such as strategic partnerships, value of official statistics, capability development, etc.;

(h) It will be useful to get input from more countries about their challenges and issues in communication;

(i) Canada, France, Greece, Ireland, UK, Eurostat and OECD are interested to contribute to this work.

Conclusion:

5. The Bureau asked Canada and Ireland to make a proposal for follow up work to address the priority areas raised in the in-depth review for its October 2018 meeting. This will allow taking into account the outcome of the CES seminar on statistical communication in June 2018.

B. Gaps in gender statistics

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/3 by Mexico, 3 Add.1 by UNECE

6. The Bureau conducted an in-depth review of gaps in gender statistics based on a paper by Mexico and a supporting paper by the secretariat, and raised the following issues:

(a) Gender statistics remains of high interest to countries. It is a challenging area that creates a need for strong partnerships due to its cross-cutting nature and diversity of topics covered;

(b) The changing and often politically sensitive landscape of gender and gender identity in public discourse can lead to competing pressures: on one hand to produce more sex-disaggregated data, and on the other hand to avoid questions on sex and gender altogether;

(c) There was strong support for the main thematic priorities identified in the in-depth review paper, namely time-use surveys, unpaid work, and violence against women;

(d) The list of non-thematic priorities should include the use of new data sources and new technologies, especially in time-use surveys and household budget surveys;

(e) Efforts should focus on highlighting the merits of time-use surveys, the value of standardizing and harmonizing these surveys across countries, and the potential of modern tools and techniques for reducing the burden and cost. It would be useful to explore the reasons for resistance to conducting time-use surveys as part of NSOs' standard portfolios, and how such resistance could be reduced;

(f) Future work must build on what has already been done on time-use surveys in UNECE and other organizations. The work should align with and not duplicate current work in UNSD, UN Women, and the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Gender Statistics;

(g) OECD, Eurostat and IMF will provide further information for the section of the review dealing with activities of international organizations in gender statistics.

Conclusion:

7. The in-depth review paper should be shared with the UNECE Steering Group on Gender Statistics and the participants of the UNECE Work Session on Gender Statistics in November, to propose areas for focus within the agreed-upon priority areas.

8. The Bureau asked Mexico, with the help of the UNECE Steering Group, to incorporate additional inputs from international organizations in the paper, and to make a proposal for follow-up activities to address the issues raised in the in-depth review for the February 2018 Bureau meeting. This will be linked with the scheduled review of the terms of reference of the Steering Group on gender statistics.

III. UNECE Statistical Programme

A. Statistical Programme for 2018 and UNECE strategic framework for statistics 2020-2021

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/4 and 12 by UNECE

9. The Bureau discussed the draft UNECE Statistical Programme for 2018 and the UNECE strategic framework for the subprogramme on statistics for 2020-2021. Under the Statistical Programme, the various steering groups and task forces created by CES and its Bureau were considered. The terms of reference of the active groups are available at www.unece.org/stats/ToS.html.

Conclusion:

10. The Bureau adopted the Statistical Programme for 2018 subject to reflecting the suggestions made in the discussion on individual items presented below.

11. The Bureau adopted the Strategic Framework for 2020-2021. The Bureau asked the Secretariat to submit the Statistical Programme 2018 and the Strategic Framework 2020-2021 for adoption to the CES plenary session in June 2018.

B. National accounts

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/BUR/5 by the Group of Experts on National Accounts

12. The Bureau discussed the proposal of the meeting of the Group of Experts on National Accounts and the Steering Group on National Accounts to establish a standing body on national accounts under CES, and raised the following issues:

(a) The terms of reference of the standing body should ensure the continued streamlining of work between UNECE, Eurostat and OECD, and avoid any duplication. The possibility to label the outputs of the national accounts work done by UNECE, Eurostat and OECD as joint outputs should be pursued. The standing body should promote clear division of labour and give visibility to each organization for their work on national accounts;

(b) The group should support linking the work on the System of National Accounts (SNA) with SDGs to complement the work on implementation of the *CES Road Map on Statistics for SDGs*;

(c) The standing body should support implementation of 2008 SNA in all UNECE member countries. In doing so, it would also address emerging topics that relate to national accounts.

Conclusion:

13. The Bureau supported the idea of establishing a standing body on national accounts under CES. The Bureau asked the Secretariat to prepare, together with the Steering Group on National Accounts, terms of reference for the standing body, and present them to the CES Bureau in February 2018 for approval before submission to the UNECE Executive Committee in 2018.

C. Set of key climate change-related indicators

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/6 by the Task Force

14. The Bureau reviewed the terms of reference for the continuation of the work of the Task Force on a set of core climate change-related statistics, and raised the following issues:

(a) The United Nations Committee of Experts on Environmental-Economic Accounting (UNCEEA) requested the group to consider the financial flows related to climate change, and continue to work in coordination with UNCEEA. Close links to the development of SEEA should be maintained;

(b) The UNECE Steering Group on climate change-related statistics should continue the close engagement with climate experts through future Expert Fora.

Conclusion:

15. The Bureau approved the terms of reference for the Task Force on a set of core climate change-related statistics, and asked the Task Force to report back to the CES Bureau in February 2019. The Bureau encouraged the Expert Forum for producers and users of climate change-related statistics to discuss the progress of work and provide expert advice to the Task Force as needed.

D. Waste statistics

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/7 by the Task Force

16. The Bureau reviewed the work plan for the Task Force on waste statistics, and raised the following issues:

(a) The Task Force may seek advice from a wider group of experts without establishing a formal advisory board for that purpose;

(b) The Task Force should take into account user and policy needs related to waste statistics. For example, the OECD environmental performance review of Czechia includes a section on waste and circular economy. The carbon accounting framework should also be considered;

(c) Data on waste that are needed for policy making do not always come from official statistics. It would be important to consider the boundaries and different data sources, and how to deal with the non-official and official statistics;

(d) The work contributes to improved global waste statistics, and to developing a chapter on waste statistics in the *Manual on the Basic Set of Environment Statistics* being prepared by UNSD.

Conclusion:

17. The Bureau approved the work plan of the Task Force on waste statistics.

E. Measuring extreme events and disasters

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/8 by the Task Force

18. The Bureau reviewed the work plan for the Task Force on extreme events and disasters, and raised the following issues:

(a) The Task Force could review possible data sources outside of statistical systems, such as commercially available sources (e.g. from insurance companies);

(b) The Task Force should consider how to deal with confidentiality when making available data from the statistical system for management of extreme events and disasters. In some cases, statisticians may recommend to disaster risk experts to access other data sources without confidentiality limits, such as administrative sources;

(c) Statistical offices could help to reconstruct the history of extreme events, to review their impacts and assess disaster risks. Having information on previous disasters will help to decide what needs to be done when a similar disaster strikes;

(d) The Task Force on measuring extreme events and disasters met on 6 October and decided on some changes to the work plan.

Conclusion:

19. The Bureau approved the work plan of the Task Force on measuring extreme events and disasters in principle. The Bureau asked the Task Force to provide an updated work plan (taking into account the recent changes) and progress report to the Bureau in February 2018.

F. Strategic partnerships

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/9 by Canada and United Kingdom

20. The Bureau reviewed the work plan on strategic partnerships, and discussed the planned high-level seminar and conducting a survey of national statistical offices to collect information on their experiences and challenges in this area. The Bureau raised the following issues:

(a) The objectives of the seminar should reflect that, as a first meeting, it is intended to highlight opportunities, successes and failures rather than provide guidelines;

(b) The part of the seminar with the participation of external partners should focus on their expectations and opportunities, and create a positive image of potential partnerships with statistical offices. This part of the seminar could take place first, to allow the statistical community to reflect on the outcomes of the discussions;

(c) It is important to identify and invite the right people from among external partners, such as businesses, academia, civil society, etc. The seminars held by OECD and Eurostat on related topics can provide ideas;

(d) The partnerships with standards' bodies and with "trusted third-parties" such as academia could be considered, as well as networks of partners. It will be good to see what kind of legal, organizational and financial models for partnerships are used, and to cover different experiences.

(e) Case studies of both successes and failures should be considered at the seminar. France and Mexico could present their experience from partnerships with mobile telephone companies;

(f) The need for partnerships in the context of statistics for SDGs could be considered. On one hand, this can attract attention and increase participation. On the other hand, the issue of partnerships is much wider and there is a risk of diverting the focus of the meeting to SDG issues.

Conclusion:

21. The Bureau approved the work plan on strategic partnerships, including organizing a high-level seminar on 11-12 April 2018, and surveying statistical organizations. The Bureau asked the group that developed the proposal to report back on the outcomes of the seminar to the October 2018 meeting of the Bureau.

G. Geospatial data and statistics

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/10 by UNECE

22. The Bureau discussed the developments concerning collaboration between UNECE and the European group of the United Nations Initiative on Global Geospatial Information Management (UN-GGIM: Europe), and raised the following points:

(a) Greater integration of the statistical and geospatial communities is needed;

(b) The proposal for collaborative work goes in the right direction but the process should move faster;

(c) UNECLAC and UNECA found the necessary human resources to support and service the geospatial activities in their regions. Similar resources are also needed in UNECE;

(d) The 2020 round of population and housing censuses is an opportunity to increase collaboration;

(e) A broad partnership is needed covering not just data access but also the use of data in areas such as climate change and disaster monitoring;

(f) There is an interdependence between the use of geospatial data for statistical production and dissemination (e.g., satellite imagery can be used in both);

(g) Confidentiality and charging for data are issues that need to be addressed when cooperating with national mapping and cartographic agencies. Official statisticians can provide advice on how to deal with confidentiality issues;

(h) Building trust and relationships at the level of top management is a key. A high-level seminar bringing together heads of national statistical, mapping and cartographic agencies would be useful. A first step could be to invite representatives of the UN-GGIM: Europe Executive Committee to a CES Bureau meeting and/or to have a joint session;

(i) UK would be ready to lead a group/network on geospatial information management.

Conclusion:

23. The Bureau supported the proposals for greater collaboration between UNECE and UN-GGIM: Europe. The Bureau stressed the importance of allocating sufficient resources in the UNECE Secretariat to support closer integration of statistics and geospatial information.

24. The Bureau expressed willingness to invite representatives of the UN-GGIM: Europe Executive Committee to a CES Bureau meeting or organize a joint session. Eurostat offered to include UNECE in the organization of the joint annual conferences of Eurostat and UN-GGIM: Europe in future.

H. Developing capabilities in official statistics

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/11 by UNECE

25. The Bureau discussed the priorities in developing capabilities in official statistics, and raised the following issues:

(a) It is important to align capacity development activities to national priorities, not primarily to the agendas of donor organizations, and to take into account absorption capacity in the countries;

(b) Capability development should be results oriented and take into account the costs and benefits;

(c) The more analytical approach based on capabilities and maturity models proposed by UNECE was welcomed;

(d) Capability development should be seen as a public good, and where possible, should be targeted at groups of countries rather than individual countries;

(e) UNECE is uniquely placed to help the countries in the eastern part of its region;

(f) New data sources are likely to be a priority area for capacity development in the next few years.

Conclusion:

26. The Bureau asked the Secretariat to prepare a Statistical Capability Development Strategy and present it to the February 2018 Bureau meeting, with the aim of submitting it to the 2018 CES plenary session for endorsement.

I. Guidelines on national reporting platforms

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/22 and Add.1 by Task Force on National Reporting Platforms

27. The Bureau reviewed the draft *Guidelines on national mechanisms for providing data on SDG indicators* and the *Description of National Reporting Platforms* (NRPs), and raised the following issues:

(a) The documents are very useful for practical work in the countries for setting up mechanisms to provide data on SDGs. For example, Armenia has used the guidelines extensively in establishing their system of disseminating SDG indicators for the country;

(b) The documents can be interpreted as recommending a specific solution for the SDG data flows which have not yet been agreed at the global level. Therefore it may be better to publish them not as guidelines but as a description of possible platforms and how to decide whether to set up such a platform. The documents should be in line with the decisions by the IAEG-SDGs and the UN Statistical Commission;

(c) The issue is not only the data flows but also the governance of SDG reporting. The guidelines strongly support the key role of national statistical offices in the coordination of statistics for SDGs;

(d) Custodian agencies may approach different national organizations for the SDG indicators and bypass NSOs. The coordination in practice may be difficult even when NSO has been officially given the coordination role for providing data for SDGs. National Reporting Platforms can be one way to make the coordination happen;

(e) A platform for providing the SDG data should not be a stand-alone system but an integral part of the statistical production and dissemination processes. These platforms should be in line with SDMX standards to enable multiple and easy access to the data. Setting up separate platforms may divert the focus from the compilation of high-quality information.

Conclusion:

28. The Task Force on National Reporting Platforms will revise the documents to take into account comments made by the Bureau, and publish them under the responsibility of the Steering Group.

IV. Follow-up to the 2017 plenary session

A. Evaluation of the 65th plenary session

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/13 by UNECE

29. The results of evaluation questionnaires of the 2017 CES plenary session were presented for information. The 2017 CES plenary session received the highest evaluation so far (since 2003 when the evaluation questionnaires were introduced). The Bureau asked the Secretariat to continue to explore ways to allow interactive participation of the audience in the CES discussions.

B. Follow- up to the CES 2017 seminar on measuring poverty; Guide on Poverty Measurement

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/14, 14 Add.1 and Add.2 by the Task Force

30. The Bureau reviewed *CES Guide on Poverty Measurement*, revised after the 2017 CES plenary session. The Bureau also reviewed the terms of reference for a Task Force on disaggregated poverty measures. The following issues were raised:

(a) The Task Force should consider new ways to capture poverty in light of leaving no-one behind, such as looking at modern slavery, destitute, traveller communities, illiterate people etc. It should consider the disaggregations required for SDG reporting related to poverty;

(b) It will be important to work on multidimensional poverty measures that enable an individual's viewpoint and a narrative that empowers people to take action. The perspective of the most marginalized people in society will be important;

(c) The Task Force should also consider the disaggregations relating to gender, and coordinate its work with the Task Force on institutional populations. The work has links to the measurement of wealth of households;

(d) Mexico plans to translate the *Guide on poverty measurement* into Spanish;

(e) Canada, Mexico, Eurostat and OECD expressed willingness to participate in the Task Force.

Conclusions

31. The Bureau approved the revised *CES Guide on Poverty Measurement.* The Bureau approved the terms of reference of a Task Force on disaggregated poverty measures subject to taking into account the comments made by the Bureau.

C. Follow-up to the CES 2017 seminar on the next generation of statisticians and data scientists

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/15 by Finland

32. The Bureau discussed follow-up work to the 2017 CES seminar on the next generation of statisticians and data scientists based on a proposal by the seminar organizer, Finland. The discussion mainly focused on the use of hackathons. These activities can produce excellent results in a short timeframe and motivate people. However, innovation cannot rely only on hackathons. Hackathons should be used in addition to other activities and as part of a long-term agenda.

Conclusion:

33. The Bureau supported the follow-up actions listed in the paper and asked the High-Level Group on the Modernisation of Official Statistics (HLG-MOS) to take up in its work the recommendations in para 7 of the document. The Bureau will take stock of HLG-MOS activities at its February 2018 meeting.

V. Preparation of the CES 2018 plenary session

A. Organization of the 2018 CES seminar on "Measuring what matters – broadening official statistics"

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/16 by Poland in collaboration with Israel, New Zealand, Slovakia and UNECE

34. The Bureau discussed the organization of the 2018 CES seminar on "Measuring what matters – broadening official statistics" based on an outline prepared by the Seminar Organizer, Poland, in collaboration with Israel, New Zealand, Slovakia and UNECE.

35. The Bureau agreed with the proposed outline of the seminar and noted that outputs from this work should be interactive and electronic, rather than paper publications. Statistics Denmark has done some work in this area, and may present their experience.

Conclusion:

36. The seminar will take place on Monday, 18 June 2018, starting at 09:40 and finishing at 15:30. The seminar organizers will proceed with the preparations and will present an updated proposal for the seminar to the February 2018 Bureau meeting.

B. Organization of the 2018 CES seminar on "Getting our message across: Strategic reflections on modernizing statistical communication"

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/17 by Albania in collaboration with Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands and UNECE

37. The Bureau discussed the organization of the 2018 CES seminar on "Getting our message across: Strategic reflections on modernizing statistical communication" based on an outline prepared by the Seminar Organizer, Albania, in collaboration with Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands and UNECE. The Bureau agreed with the proposed outline of the seminar with the following comments:

- The keynote speech from the Netherlands should discuss the outcomes and lessons learned from their new communication strategy. For example, how the efforts to modernise communication are perceived by the public;
- An interesting speaker would be an expert in psychology of how people perceive information. For maintaining its relevance, official statistics should tell stories that reach both the hearts and minds of the audience;
- Eurostat and OECD offered to contribute papers.

Conclusion:

38. The seminar will take place on Tuesday, 19 June 2018, starting at 09:30 and finishing at 15:30. The seminar organizers will proceed with the preparations and present an updated proposal for the seminar to the February 2018 Bureau meeting, taking into account the recommendations by the Bureau.

C. Draft agenda and timetable for the 2018 CES plenary session

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/18 by UNECE

39. The 66th CES plenary session will take place on 18-20 June 2018 in Geneva, back-to-back with the OECD Committee on Statistics and Statistical Policy. The Secretariat will prepare an updated timetable of the 2018 CES plenary session for the February 2018 meeting of the Bureau.

IV. CES Guidelines and recommendations for endorsement in 2018

A. Leading, composite and sentiment indicators

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/19 and 19/Add.1 by the Task Force

40. The Bureau reviewed the progress of work in preparing the *Guidelines for producing leading, composite and sentiment indicators*, and made the following comments:

- The draft guidelines are very useful as these types of indicators are becoming more common;
- The guidelines should clarify and give guidance on the possible role(s) of national statistical offices in producing leading, composite and sentiment indicators;
- There are many different types of composite and leading indicators, therefore it is difficult to have detailed generic guidelines that apply to all. The Guidelines should focus on main issues, such as communication;
- Seminars to exchange experiences are useful. They may be organised to focus on one or two types of indicators, rather than trying to cover all;
- UNSD offered to organize a global consultation of the guidelines, and seek possible endorsement at the global level.

Conclusion:

41. The Bureau extended the mandate of the Task Force until June 2019 to allow for enough time for finalising the draft guidelines. The interim guidelines will be submitted to the CES plenary session for comments in 2018. Following the plenary session, the updated guidelines will be again considered at the October 2018 meeting of the Bureau, and be submitted to the CES 2019 plenary session for endorsement.

B. Entrepreneurship statistics

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/20 and 20/Add.1 by the Task Force

42. The Bureau reviewed progress of work and the outline of the *Guidelines on the production of entrepreneurship statistics*, and made the following comments:

- The scope of the Guidelines should be clarified, particularly the relationship with business demography statistics. Measuring globalization and managing complex business structures is not in the scope of the Guidelines. Using data that already exists to measure entrepreneurship is well covered;
- It would be useful to include material on sources other than business registers, for example, economic censuses. This would be particularly useful for countries that do not yet have fully developed business registers;
- Integrating data from multiple sources, including business registers, is becoming increasingly important;
- The Guidelines should also refer to work done by other groups in this area, such as Eurostat, OECD, etc., to ensure harmonization across organizations.

Conclusion:

43. The Task Force will finalize the draft guidelines taking into account comments by the Bureau. The Secretariat will circulate the Guidelines for electronic consultation among all CES members in view of submitting them for endorsement at the 2018 CES plenary session.

VII. Principles of rotation of the members of the Inter-agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs) and the High-level group on partnership, cooperation and capacity building for the 2030 Agenda (HLG-PCCB) in the UNECE region

Documentation: ECE/CES/BUR/2017/OCT/21 by UNECE

44. The Bureau discussed the criteria for rotation of the members from the UNECE region in the Inter-agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs) and the High-level group on partnership, cooperation and capacity building for the 2030 Agenda (HLG-PCCB). The Bureau raised the following issues:

- The principles for the rotation of members in these groups should be agreed and made public;
- There should be common principles at the global level, an issue that should be raised with UNSD and UNSC;
- The work should be open and transparent. It is very important to keep non-member countries informed about the discussions in the groups. The IAEG-SDGs and HLG-PCCB members should consult with other countries from their sub-region;
- It is important to maximise representation from the different sub-regions, taking into account that there is an overlapping membership between some Regional Commissions.

Conclusion:

45. The Bureau will continue the discussion to agree on the principles of rotation of the members of these groups in UNECE region. The Bureau asked the secretariat to prepare an updated draft document for its meeting in February 2018.

VIII. Dates and venue of next meetings

46. The Bureau confirmed the dates and venues for its forthcoming meetings as follows:

- 14-15 February 2018 (Helsinki);
- 16-17 October 2018 (Geneva);
- Beginning of March 2019 (Washington D.C., back-to-back with the UN Statistical Commission).

47. The 66th CES plenary session will take place on 18-20 (a.m.) June 2018 in Geneva, back-to-back with the meeting of the OECD Committee on Statistics and Statistical Policy.

48. The 67th CES plenary session will take place on the week of 17 June 2019 in Paris, back-to-back with the meeting of the OECD Committee on Statistics and Statistical Policy.

IX. Other business

49. The Secretariat thanked Eurostat, OECD and CIS-Stat for the continuous good cooperation and collaboration in supporting the statistical development for the countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia.

50. All finalized papers of the CES Bureau meeting are available on the public web page: www.unece.org/index.php?id=43850

United Nations ECE/CES/2018/14/Add.15

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
15 May 2018

English only

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians
Sixty-sixth plenary session
Geneva, 18-20 June 2018
Item 11 (a) of the provisional agenda
Programme of work of the Statistics subprogramme of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
Reports on the work of the Conference of European Statisticians, its Bureau and Teams of Specialists

Implementation of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Statistical Programme 2017

Note by the secretariat

Addendum

Report of the joint UNECE/UN-GGIM: Europe Workshop on Integrating Geospatial and Statistical Standards

Summary

The document presents the key outcomes of the joint UNECE/UN-GGIM: Europe Workshop on Integrating Geospatial and Statistical Standards which took place from 6 to 8 November 2017 in Stockholm, Sweden. The meeting was conducted under the work programme of the Conference of European Statisticians.

The report is submitted to the Conference of European Statisticians for information.

GE.18-07811(E)

1807811

Please recycle

I. Attendance

1. Under the work programme of the Conference of European Statisticians, the joint UNECE/UN-GGIM: Europe Workshop on Integrating Geospatial and Statistical Standards was held in Stockholm, Sweden, from 6-8 November 2017. The workshop was aimed at experts on statistical and geospatial metadata or technical standards relevant to the modernisation of statistics, in addition to experts from national mapping, cadastral or environmental agencies.

2. It was attended by participants from: Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, as well as by representatives from the European Commission, EuroGeographics, UN GGIM, UNECA, UNECE, UNMIK, and OECD. Participants from research institutes, standards organisations, universities and private sector also attended the workshop.

II. Organization of the meeting

3. The workshop was conducted through a combination of presentations by experts from the national/regional statistical institutes and geospatial information agencies, panel and group discussion sessions. The programme of the workshop consisted of the following substantive topics.

- Session 1: Introduction to statistical and geospatial standards and models;
- Session 2: Examples of integrating statistical and geospatial standards and models;
- Session 3: Challenges and solutions for creating geospatial statistical outputs;
- Session 4 (panel): Future work relevant to statistical and geospatial standards.

4. Ms. Therese Lalor (UNECE) opened the workshop and Mr. Janusz Dygaszewicz, chair of the workshop from the Central Statistical Office of Poland, welcomed participants.

5. Ms. Helen Stoye, Acting Director General of Statistics Sweden, welcomed the participants on behalf of Statistics Sweden. She noted that users increasingly need digitized services combining statistical and geospatial information. The workshop provides a unique opportunity to increase the collaboration between the statistical and geospatial communities.

6. The following persons acted as Session Organizers:

- Session 1: Klas Blomqvist (Swedish Research Council) and Luis Gerardo Esparza (National Institute of Statistics and Geography, Mexico);
- Session 2: Marie Haldorson (Statistics Sweden) and Janusz Dygaszewicz (Central Statistical Office, Poland);
- Session 3: Timothy Trainor (U.S. Census Bureau) and Ekkehard Petri (Eurostat);
- Session 4: Martin Brady (Australian Bureau of Statistics) and Carol Agius (EuroGeographics).

7. All background documents, presentations and the final report for the meeting are available on the website of the UNECE Statistical Division: https://www.unece.org/index.php?id=45404

III. Summary of the discussion and main conclusions reached at the meeting

A. Introduction to Statistical and Geospatial Standards and Models

8. This session was chaired by Klas Blomqvist (Swedish Research Council) and Luis Gerardo Esparza (National Institute of Statistics and Geography, Mexico).

9. The session opened with a panel discussing the statistical standards (Generic Activity Model for Statistical Organizations, Generic Statistical Business Process Model, Generic Statistical Information Model and Common Statistical Production Architecture). The discussion raised the following points:

- The models are generic and are not prescriptive. There is flexibility to allow for national implementations. For example, Brazil has developed a geospatial process model based on Generic Statistical Business Process Model (GSBPM);
- The Generic Statistical Information Model (GSIM) does not include unstructured data, but does include referential metadata such as quality reports;
- The strength of the presented models is that they facilitate the statistical community to develop rigorous systems. These types of models are not necessarily a feature of the geospatial community;
- Continuous improvement can occur through the Generic Activity Model for Statistical Organisations (GAMSO) in the 'Capability Improvement' activity. Evaluation activities are present is many places in the model;
- The models have been used in some countries to discuss the business of official statistics with other government departments.

10. The second panel in the session introduced the geospatial frameworks and standards (Global Statistical Geospatial Framework, Open Geospatial Consortium and International Organization for Standardization – Technical Committee 211 Geograpahic Information/Geomatics). The discussion raised the following points:

- The GSGF is a framework, and not a standard. It was developed in partnership between the statistical and geospatial community, and is more directly applicable to the statistical community;
- There are more than 75 standards in the geospatial community. They are all currently used;
- Data exchange is one of the biggest challenges. Interactions with information are changing as the technological environment changes. It is an appropriate time to discuss this issue as changes are needed;
- Statisticians want a comprehensive view of available high quality geospatial data. There are use cases (for example sample design) where geospatial data could be used, but it is not possible to access the data. This will be important for the 2020 census round and beyond;
- New developments such as evolution of satellite data highlights the importance of having interoperable standards to ensure that two communities can address the new user needs more efficiently and seamlessly.

11. Following the panels, three presentations were given:

- United Kingdom - Removing spatial silos: Delivering spatial statistics in the UK through standards;
- Australia - Exploring the role and application of Discrete Global Grid Systems to integrate statistical and geospatial information;
- European Commission - StatDCAT and GeoDCAT application profile.

12. The following points were raised in the discussion:

- Many countries are experiencing similar problems in terms of raising awareness and changing culture. Opportunities to train and increase exposure between the communities will help them to better understand each other;
- The Discrete Global Grid Systems will be developed in an adaptive way. It will be possible to map to whatever level that is required. There is no preference for a particular grid yet but several implementations are looking at consistent grid specifications and implementations. It is important that the different methods interface with each other;
- If all locations have a unique identifier, this can create additional burden when producing linked data. Despite this burden there is value in creating this linked data. Organizations will determine the level of detail that makes sense to them;
- For some grid cells/pixels, the data included may be sensitive (due to the number of statistical units or the underlying unit record data included) and methods to protect these data will be required.

13. The chairs of the session made the following concluding remarks:

- The statistical and geospatial 'standards' are operating on different levels. The models and frameworks of the statistical community are at a conceptual level. The geospatial standards are at a technical level;
- It is important to build understanding between the communities and to identify where the touchpoints are to help establish common projects;
- The demand for information is going to be bigger than any one organisation. The two communities can meet and learn from each other.

B. Ensuring collaboration across communities

14. This session was organized by Carol Agius (EuroGeographics) and Martin Brady (Australian Bureau of Statistics).

15. The first panel session included Chris Body (ISO/TC211), Klas Blomqvist (Swedish Research Council), Pier-Giorgio Zaccheddu (Fed. Agency for Cartography and Geodesy, Germany), Janusz Dygaszewicz (Central Statistical Office, Poland) and Greg Scott (UN-GGIM). The following points were raised in the discussion:

- The geospatial and statistical communities have cooperated for many years. It is important to recognise that in the context of recent growth in understanding, coordination and coherence;
- Both statistical and geospatial organisations provide information for better decision making. There are shared objectives and mandates;
- It would be useful to understand the interdependencies between the communities – what are the gaps and overlaps. Both current and future activities should be considered when discussing this;

- International collaboration has real benefits. It should be supported through national institutional arrangements to ensure that the cooperation can continue to evolve. To collaborate effectively, there needs to be support from senior management and followed up with a long term, sustainable commitment;
- It is important to be clear of the business requirements for collaboration. Common projects and use cases should be identified. The test beds in OGC can be used to test the use cases;
- Sustainable Development Goals are a key driver and opportunity for the communities to collaborate;
- We should not be afraid to broaden the communities. There is always work to do – we need as many people as possible! Possible collaborators at the expert level include industry, statistical organisations, government ministries, mapping agencies, INSPIRE, Earth Observation Community, ISO liaisons, and UN Expert Group on Classifications;
- Two communities are facing information demand that cannot be addressed by one community alone with increasing challenge from outside competitors;
- Data should be fit for many purposes. Data (either geospatial or statistical) are now consumed by many different communities with different requirements;
- Areas for collaboration should be drawn from user needs. How can the communities work together to provide answers to user questions?
- The word standard needs to be clarified. Many of the statistical 'standards' are frameworks and models, and some of the technical geographic standards could also be called classifications.

C. Examples of Integrating Statistical and Geospatial Standards and Models

16. This session was organized by Marie Haldorson (Statistics Sweden) and Janusz Dygaszewicz (Central Statistical Office, Poland). The session was opened by Marie Haldorson who reflected that we need to be clear what is meant by models, frameworks and standards. Models and frameworks are generic and are open to many different contexts and provide countries with something to benchmark against. On the other hand, standards are more precise, defined and cannot be too generic so that they may be interpreted in a specific way without risk of misunderstanding.

17. The session included the following presentations:

- UNECA - Strategic framework for the integration of statistical and geospatial information in Africa;
- European Commission - Integration of INSPIRE & SDMX data infrastructures;
- Mexico - Mexico's experience in integrating geographic and statistical information;
- Germany - Integrating GSGF and GSBPM – Experiences from Official Statistics Germany;
- Australia - Location information in statistical modernisation transformation;
- Finland - Towards connecting geospatial information and statistical standards in statistical production: Two cases from Statistics Finland;

- Italy - The Experience of reusing WebGIS application templates applied to the integration of statistical and geospatial information;
- Poland - Harmonization of statistical and geodetic divisions in the context of 10 level model, to develop a common framework as a standard of geospatial data production;
- Mongolia - Integrating satellite imagery and geo-spatial data with administrative registration to produce official statistics;
- Switzerland - The collaborative approach between the Federal Statistical Office and the Federal Office of Topography for maintaining a geocoded building and dwelling register used as a base for the production of geostatistical data;

18. The following points were raised in the discussion:

- It is difficult to quantify the benefits of INSPIRE. There are many benefits reported relating to the opening up of public data;
- The Statistical Data and Metadata eXchange (SDMX) Data Structure Definitions (DSDs) for Census are INSPIRE compliant. Also, SDMX and GSIM have been mapped, so it should be possible to map geospatial data to GSIM. This should be examined in the GSIM review;
- The GSIM mapping to SDMX should be updated following the revision;
- Using different geometric layers can open new possibilities for reporting data. For example, a line can be used to represent statistical indicators on roads and transport;
- Both statistical and geographic agencies store unit level data and only disseminate data at aggregate levels. It is particularly important to store georeferenced statistical and administrative data at as fine a level as possible, ideally at the point level, as geographic areas that data is aggregated to can change over time;
- Most countries have a unique identifier for an address. Other countries have a unique identifier for a household. It is possible to have both.

19. Following the presentations, the participants formed small groups to discuss future collaboration opportunities. The groups proposed several opportunities:

- Provide input into the GSBPM and GSIM reviews on how geospatial processes and information can be represented;
- Encourage statistical offices to consider geospatial data as part of their core data;
- Include statistical data in the UNGGIM fundamental data;
- Identify common projects that are centered on the needs of users and clients;
- Collaborate on address and building registers, which are a key need for both communities. One suggestion is to work on an ontology for addresses and buildings that could be used as a reference;
- Initiate a project on data exchange – how to connect the pipes between statistical and geospatial offices;
- Keep communicating and clarifying the language between the communities. It is important to raise awareness and change perspectives;
- Develop communication materials explaining the different frameworks and how they work together;
- Involve vendors who can build tools to support standards;

- Document the common core metadata for geospatial data;
- Identify the key people in both communities who can make decisions and lead the way;
- Consider opportunities in relation to SDGs and Census 2020.

D. Challenges and Solutions for Creating Geospatial Statistical Outputs

20. This session was organized by Timothy Trainor (U.S. Census Bureau) and Ekkehard Petri (Eurostat). It included the following presentations:

- Canada – Canada's approach to integrating socio-economic and environmental statistics with geo-spatial information;
- Poland – Investigation of linked open data technologies for purposes of publishing georeferenced statistical data;
- Japan – World Grid Square Statistics and their application to data analytics;
- Portugal – Location analytics in administrative data to produce House Price Statistics in Portugal;
- United States – Innovative effort to transform and expand dissemination of Census Bureau content to improve service to internal and external customers;
- Finland – OCG Table Joining Service standard revision;
- Institute for Employment Research - Enabling spatial research using German administrative data – A grid-cell approach.

21. The following points were raised in the discussion:

- Implementation experience has shown that statistical data needed to be adjusted to meet the geography standards on open platforms. It is not trivial work, but it can be done.
- Governments value data today in ways they have not in the past. This environment can change the risk appetite of organisations who hold data. There is a move in some countries to be less risk adverse regarding access to data;
- Data from statistical offices that are put on open platforms are subject to the usual confidentiality processes used for any output;
- In the implementations discussed, often the statistical data is stored separately from the geospatial data. This is often due to organisational issues. While there are some distinct aspects to geospatial information these should not be considered special (unusual) and therefore the reason for separate storage should be questioned;
- One lesson learned from implementation experience is to not overcomplicate it before you start;
- The use of standards in implementations can be successful, but the standardisation of the human factor is often difficult.

E. Future Work relevant to Statistical and Geospatial Standards

22. This session was organized by Carol Agius (EuroGeographics) and Martin Brady (Australian Bureau of Statistics).

23. The second panel session included Ingo Simonis (OGC), Márta Nagy-Rothengass (Eurostat), Timo Aarnio (National Land Survey of Finland), Ian Coady (Office for National Statistics, UK), Tim Trainor (U.S. Census Bureau) and David Barraclough (OECD).

24. The following challenges and opportunities were raised in the discussion:

- Concepts - We need agreement on conceptual issues, so they can be reflected in the standards. Technology can bring conceptual models together;
- Standards – When exchanging data in a machine to machine manner, standards are important. The geospatial dimension is missing in SDMX, this should be discussed;
- Data - Integration is not rocket science. It is important to ensure that you are combining the correct values. Having persistent identifiers would help with this;
- Culture - There is a need to build understanding – not just between statistical and geospatial communities, but also between people who work in standards governance and technical people;
- Communication - It is not always clear how to find information on the standards, how they relate to each other and how to begin using them;
- Management – It is important to raise the importance of this work with the senior management. It is important to build high level support. Census 2020 and the SDGs are a key driver, so benefits can be linked to them;
- Timeliness – The world is changing, and we may need new standards. The standards development process is not necessarily a fast process;
- Working method – the communities should identify concrete projects and use cases. These should be worked in an iterative or agile way. Use small pilot projects to show the value of the work.

25. The following proposals were made for future work:

- A pitch statement to present to senior managers and leaders to gain buy-in and funding;
- A beginner's guide to using standards from both communities;
- Both communities to develop communication materials that simply describe the interrelationships between their frameworks, models and standards;
- Pilot to determine options for persistent ids to link aggregate statistical outputs to standard geographies;
- Look for opportunities to work on semantic interoperability issues (for example, ontology for addresses and buildings);
- Improve the discoverability of geospatial tools that are based on standards;
- Guidance on how to store geospatial objects references/links in existing statistical databases;
- Map the data exchange process between statistical and geospatial organisations
- Examine comparative use cases for application of traditional geography and emerging grid technologies, particularly for dissemination of statistics;
- Examine pathways and interest within Statistical Community to move to formal ISO Standards for models and frameworks in addition to existing ones (e.g. ISO/TC 154);

United Nations ECE/CES/2018/14/Add.16

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
16 May 2018

English only

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians
Sixty-sixth plenary session
Geneva, 18-20 June 2018
Item 11 (a) of the provisional agenda
Programme of work of the Statistics subprogramme of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
Reports on the work of the Conference of European Statisticians, its Bureau and Teams of Specialists

Implementation of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Statistical Programme 2017

Note by the secretariat

Addendum

Workshop on the Modernisation of Official Statistics

Summary

The document presents the key outcomes of the Workshop on the Modernisation of Official Statistics which took place from 22-23 November 2017 in Geneva. The meeting was organized following a decision of CES in June 2017.

The report is submitted to the Conference of European Statisticians for information.

GE.18-07814(E)
1807814

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. The Workshop on the Modernisation of Official Statistics was held in Geneva, Switzerland, on 22-23 November 2017. The workshop was attended by representatives from the statistical offices of Canada, Estonia, Finland, France, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Serbia, Slovenia, Sweden, and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland as well as by representatives from the Statistical Office of the European Union (Eurostat) and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

II. Organization of the seminar

2. Ms. T. Lalor, Chief of the Statistical Management and Modernisation Unit of the UNECE Statistical Division, opened the workshop and welcomed participants.

3. Mr. P. Dalton, Chair of the High-Level Group for the Modernisation of Official Statistics (HLG-MOS), gave the keynote presentation. His presentation acknowledged the work to date by the modernisation community on processes and data related topics. Although these topics are still important; there should also be a focus on products and services. Statistical organisations need to turn data into knowledge and information, and provide insight. It is necessary to be innovative with products and services without forgetting the core user base (citizens, researchers).

4. The participants adopted the agenda.

5. The following substantive topics were discussed at the meeting:

- Session 1: Reports from 2017 HLG-MOS projects;
- Session 2: Reports from Modernisation Groups;
- Session 3: Strategic Reflections;
- Session 4: Priorities for 2018.

6. All background documents and presentations for the workshop are available at http://www1.unece.org/stat/platform/display/hlgbas/Workshops.

III. Summary of the discussion and main conclusions reached at the meeting

A. Reports from 2017 HLG-MOS Projects

1. Data Architecture Project

7. Mr. C. Vaccari presented the outcomes of the Data Architecture Project. The project developed the first version of the Common Statistical Data Architecture (CSDA). The purpose of the CSDA is to support statistical organisations in the design, integration, production and dissemination of official statistics. A number of interesting use cases were identified by the project, including the UN Global Platform. The first version of the Data Architecture will be released in January 2018.

2. Data Integration Project

8. Ms. J. Borowik presented the activities undertaken within the Data Integration project. The project team further developed the practical guide for data integration in statistical organisations. Input for the guide was supplemented by a survey of statistical organisations, which included a request for use cases. The guidelines will be released in January 2018. It is proposed that a future workshop on data integration could be held to update the guide and use cases.

B. Reports from Modernisation Groups

1. 'Telling stories with SDG data' Hackathon

9. Mr. M. Cuéllar-Rio introduced the 'Telling stories with SDG data' hackathon and demonstrated the winning product from the SDGs Mexico team. During the hackathon, fifteen teams from nine countries had 64.5 hours to create a product that told a story about the younger population using the SDG indicator "Proportion of youth (aged 15-24 years) not in education, employment or training" (Indicator 8.6.1).

2. Supporting Standards Group

10. Ms. M. Signore and Ms Eva Holm presented the work of this group. The activities in 2017 included reviews of the Generic Statistical Business Process Model (GSBPM) and the Generic Statistical Information Model (GSIM), the inclusion of GSBPM terms in the metadata glossary, and quality indicators for the GSBPM. A workshop on integrating geospatial and statistical standards was also organised during the year.

3. Sharing Tools Group

11. Mr. T. Gjaltema, Mr. T. Falch, Ms. E. Holm and Mr. P. Peyronnel reported on this group. The presentation highlighted the development of the variable package for the Logical Information Model, the Common Statistical Production Architecture (CSPA) in practice and work to provide additional detail and options for IT staff developing services. The "CSPA for Digital Transformation" workshop was held in July 2017.

4. Capabilities and Communication Group

12. Ms. A. Borowska and Mr. B. Whitestone presented the work of this group. Main activities have included risk management training, a training framework for key statistical skills based on GSBPM and assistance to effectively communicate HLG-MOS products (brochures, communication materials for hackathon, blogs). The group also organised the workshop on implementing efficiencies and quality of output during the year.

5. Blue Skies Thinking Network

13. Mr. B. Braaksma reported on the work of the network. Under the auspices of the network, a small group of countries have been discussing machine learning techniques for administrative data. The group will prepare a position paper on machine learning for official statistics.

C. Strategic Reflections

1. Investment Intentions

14. Mr. T. Gjaltema presented the results of the 2017 survey on the investment intentions of statistical organisations. This investment intention database is a good resource to review before starting a new project. It will provide information on whether organisations have completed or are currently undertaking similar projects.

2. Modernisation priorities: a view from Chief Statisticians

15. Mr. P. Dalton gave an overview of the modernisation priorities provided by the Chief Statisticians. Five themes were identified:

- Resilience in transformation – A big challenge for statistical organisations is to change the culture, create an appetite for risk around innovation and mobilise staff at all levels. It is important to embed innovation in the culture by empowering middle management and giving staff the assurance that they can take risks;
- Communicating – Traditionally, statistical organisations have not branded what they are and have to offer. Statistical organisations need to be proactive and increase their visibility. They have a role as provider of evidence for policy makers, and a role to provide evidence for citizens to hold decision makers accountable. There is a need to develop products that transform data and statistics into insightful information;
- Accessing and using new data sources - Using new data sources is a big challenge but not necessarily a new challenge. We have to know how to add value and tell stories that answer the questions that people want to know;
- Standards - The statistical standards are very important. GSBPM is embedded in many statistical organisations;
- Technology - Technology is critical to business operations and it is important to be aware of the challenges and opportunities it poses.

D. Priorities for 2018

16. Participants were invited to give short "soapbox" presentations. The following people presented:

- Ms. I. Choi – Future work topics identified by workshops in 2017;
- Mr. E. Baldacci – Data Access for Multi-Source Statistics;
- Mr. F. Cotton – The Questionnaire Generation Service (QGS);
- Mr. E. Deeben – The UN Global Platform;
- Mr. T. Falch – VTL Engine.

17. Ms. H. Salonen presented the HLG-MOS method of work. Representatives from the three Modernisation Groups gave short summaries of the work proposed for 2018.

18. Five project proposals were presented:

- Strategic Communication Framework Project – Mr. S. Dufour;
- Methodology Architecture Project – Mr. V. Galvin;
- Data Architecture Phase 2 Project – Mr. C. Vaccari;

- Integrated View of Modernisation Models Project – Ms. M. Signore;
- Base Ontology Project – Mr. Franck Cotton and Ms. M. Scannapieco;

19. Following presentations and discussions on these project proposals, the Workshop recommended that the 2018 projects should be the Strategic Communication Framework and Data Architecture Phase 2 projects.

20. In his summary, the Chair thanked participants for their active engagement both during the year, and over the two days of the Workshop. He thanked the participants, presenters and organisers for an excellent workshop